Tle

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,283	11/19/2003	Bo Huang	10559-886001	1064

20985 7590 03/21/2007
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
DARE, RYAN A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2186	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/718,283	HUANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan Dare	2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4 and 6-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4 and 6-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 8, 14 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nino, JR. et al., US PG Pub 2003/01217223.

3. With respect to claim 1, Nino teaches a method comprising:

converting memory access instructions into standard formatted memory access instructions, in pars 21-23 where the memory access read or write is divided into the standard format memory access commands, precharge, activate, and read (or write).

generating a plurality of memory access partitions containing corresponding subsets of the intermediary standard formatted memory access instructions, with the plurality of memory access partitions directed to specific memory banks, in pars. 21-23 where a plurality of memory access partitions consists of a precharge an activate and a read or write directed towards memory bank A or B.

generating a match set of instruction patterns, including matches of instruction patterns to the corresponding subsets of the intermediary standard formatted memory

access instructions in the plurality of memory access instructions, in pars. 26-27 where the match set is the two instructions that are combined; and

transforming the matches to vector memory access instructions, in pars. 26-27.

4. With respect to claim 8, Nino teaches the method of claim 1 in which the memory banks include a dynamic random access memory, in the abstract.

5. With respect claim 14, Nino teaches the method of claim 1 in which the vector memory access instructions comprise single memory access instructions representing multiple memory accesses to a type of memory, in par. 26.

6. With respect to claim 27, Applicant claims a computer program product that performs the method of claim 1 and is therefore rejected using similar logic.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 2-4, 6, 13, 15-18, 25-26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nino as applied to claims 1, 8, 14 and 27 above, in view of Tremblay et al., US Patent 6,571,319.

10. With respect to claim 2, Nino teaches all other limitations of the parent claim but fails to teach that the combined instruction reads or writes a multiple of a minimum data access unit. Tremblay teaches the method of claim 1 in which converting comprises converting memory access instructions that read or write less than a minimum data access unit (MDAU) to memory access instructions that read or write a multiple of the minimum data access unit, in col. 3, lines 41-48.

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the inventions of Nino and Tremblay before him at the time the invention was made, to combine the memory access system of Nino with the memory access system of Tremblay in order to combine memory store instructions before writing data to memory, thus eliminating wasted memory data bus bandwidth, as taught by Tremblay in col. 2,lines 10-14.

12. With respect to claim 3, Tremblay teaches the method of claim 2 in which converting further comprises transforming the memory access instructions that read or write the multiple of the minimum data access unit to a format including a base address plus an offset, in col. 6, lines 12-16.

13. With respect to claim 4, Nino teaches all other limitations of the parent claim but fails to teach a data flow graph. Tremblay teaches the method of claim 1 in which generating the plurality of partitions comprises:

generating a data flow graph containing basic blocks including the memory access instructions; and for each basic block, applying a set of rules, in fig. 3.

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the inventions of Nino and Tremblay before him at the time the invention was made, to combine the memory access system of Nino with the memory access system of Tremblay in order to combine memory store instructions before writing data to memory, thus eliminating wasted memory data bus bandwidth, as taught by Tremblay in col. 2,lines 10-14.

15. With respect to claim 6, Tremblay teaches the method of claim 4 in which applying comprises limiting a subnode of one of the plurality of memory access partitions to a memory read or a memory write, in col. 3, line 57 through col. 4, line 2.

16. With respect to claim 13, Nino teaches all limitations of the parent claim but fails to teach the instruction patterns comprising a pattern describing instruction semantics. Tremblay teaches the method of claim 1 in which the instruction patterns comprise a pattern describing instruction semantics, in col. 4, lines 3-12.

17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the inventions of Nino and Tremblay before him at the time the invention was made, to combine the memory access system of Nino with the memory access system of Tremblay in order to combine memory store instructions before writing data to memory, thus eliminating wasted memory data bus bandwidth, as taught by Tremblay in col. 2,lines 10-14.

18. With respect to claim 15, Tremblay teaches a compilation method comprising:

converting source code that contains memory access instructions that read or write less than a minimum data access unit (MDAU) to intermediary code that includes memory access instructions that read or write a multiple of the minimum data access unit, in col. 4, lines 3-12. The memory access instruction is a "store pair instruction" and the intermediary standard formatted memory instruction generated is a "store pair transaction".

converting the memory access instructions of the intermediary code into intermediary memory access instructions that have a format including a base address plus an offset, in col. 6, lines 12-16.

The invention of Tremblay is not directed towards a plurality of banks in a memory and therefore does not teach the last two limitations of claim 15. Nino teaches:

grouping subsets of the intermediary memory access instructions into a plurality of memory access partitions, with the plurality of memory access partitions containing intermediate memory access instructions directed to specific memory banks, in pars. 26-27 where the match set is the two instructions that are combined; and

vectorizing the intermediary memory access instructions in the subsets corresponding to the plurality of memory access partitions that match instruction patterns, in pars. 26-27.

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the inventions of Nino and Tremblay before him at the time the invention was made, to combine the memory access system of Nino with the memory access system of Tremblay in order to combine memory store instructions before writing data to memory,

thus eliminating wasted memory data bus bandwidth, as taught by Tremblay in col. 2,lines 10-14.

20. With respect to claim 16, Tremblay teaches the compilation method of claim 15 in which grouping comprises:

generating a data flow graph containing basic blocks including intermediary memory access instructions, in fig. 3; and

The invention of Tremblay is not directed towards a plurality of banks in a memory and therefore does not teach the last limitation of claim 16. Nino teaches:

generating subnodes in the plurality of the memory access partitions, each subnode including memory access instructions directed to the same operation in a memory bank corresponding to the respective memory access partition, in pars. 26-28.

21. With respect to claim 17, Tremblay teaches the compilation method of claim 16 in which the operation is a read, in col. 3, line 57 through col. 4, line 2.

22. With respect to claim 18, Tremblay teaches the compilation method of claim 16 in which the operation is a write in, col. 3, line 57 through col. 4, line 2.

23. With respect claim 20, Nino teaches the method of claim 1 in which the memory bank is a dynamic random access memory, in the abstract.

24. With respect to claim 25, Tremblay teaches the compilation method of claim 15 in which the instruction patterns comprises instruction semantics, in col. 4, lines 3-12.

25. With respect to claim 26, Tremblay teaches the compilation method of claim 25 in which the instruction semantics comprises segments, in col. 4, lines 3-12.

26. With respect to claims 28, and 29, Applicant claims a computer program product that performs the method of claims 1, 2 and 3, respectively, and are therefore rejected using similar logic.

27. With respect to claim 30, Applicant claims the computer program product of claim 27, embodying the compilation method of claim 16 and is therefore rejected using similar logic.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

29. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

30. Claims 7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nino as applied to claim 1 above, in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, hereafter Microsoft.

31. With respect to claim 7, Tremblay teaches all parent claims as discussed above, but fails to expressly teach that the memory can be a static random access memory (SRAM).

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention using an SRAM because it is faster than DRAM as taught by Microsoft on page 182, the entry for dynamic RAM.

33. With respect to claim 9, Tremblay teaches all parent claims as discussed above, but fails to expressly teach that the memory can be a scratchpad memory.

34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention using a scratchpad memory because a scratchpad memory is high-speed, thus allowing for rapid retrieval of small items of data, as taught by Microsoft on page 466, under the definition of scratchpad.

35. With respect to claim 10, Tremblay teaches all parent claims as discussed above, but fails to expressly teach that the memory can be an EEPROM.

36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention using an EEPROM because it allows for stable storage for long periods without electricity while still allowing reprogramming, as taught by Microsoft on page 186, under the definition of EEPROM.

37. With respect to claim 11, Tremblay teaches all parent claims as discussed above, but fails to expressly teach that the memory can be a flash memory.

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention using a flash memory because it also

allows for stable storage for long periods without electricity while still allowing reprogramming, as taught by Microsoft on page 186, under the definition of EEPROM and page 216, under the definition of flash memory.

39. With respect to claim 12, Tremblay teaches all parent claims as discussed above, but fails to expressly teach that the memory can be a NVRAM.

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention using an NVRAM because it will retain data once power is removed, as taught by Microsoft on page 371, under the definitions of NVRAM and NVM.

41. Claims 19 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nino and Tremblay as applied to claims 15-16 above, in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, hereafter Microsoft.

42. With respect to claim 19, Nino and Tremblay teac all parent claims as discussed above, but fails to expressly teach that the memory can be a static random access memory (SRAM).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention using an SRAM because it is faster than DRAM as taught by Microsoft on page 182, the entry for dynamic RAM.

44. With respect to claim 21, Nino and Tremblay teach all parent claims as discussed above, but fails to expressly teach that the memory can be a scratchpad memory.

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention using a scratchpad memory because a scratchpad memory is high-speed, thus allowing for rapid retrieval of small items of data, as taught by Microsoft on page 466, under the definition of scratchpad.

46. With respect to claim 22, Nino and Tremblay teach all parent claims as discussed above, but fails to expressly teach that the memory can be an EEPROM.

47. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention using an EEPROM because it allows for stable storage for long periods without electricity while still allowing reprogramming, as taught by Microsoft on page 186, under the definition of EEPROM.

48. With respect to claim 23, Nino and Tremblay teach all parent claims as discussed above, but fails to expressly teach that the memory can be a flash memory.

49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention using a flash memory because it also allows for stable storage for long periods without electricity while still allowing reprogramming, as taught by Microsoft on page 186, under the definition of EEPROM and page 216, under the definition of flash memory.

50. With respect to claim 24, Nino and Tremblay teach all parent claims as discussed above, but fails to expressly teach that the memory can be a NVRAM.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention using an NVRAM because it will retain data once

power is removed, as taught by Microsoft on page 371, under the definitions of NVRAM and NVM.

Response to Arguments

51. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

52. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

53. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan Dare whose telephone number is (571)272-4069. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9:30-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on (571)272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan A. Dare
March 16, 2007

MATTHEW KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100